FOLLOW-UP REPORT

In Response to the Request of the Commission in the
Action Letter dated June 30, 2009

Feather River College

570 Golden Eagle Avenue
Quincy, CA 95971

Submitted: October 2009

Table of Contents

BACKGROUND OF FOLLOW-UP REPORT

After reviewing the report of the evaluation team that visited Feather River College May 7, 2009, and taking into consideration information given by Dr. Ron Taylor, Superintendent/President, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) required that Feather River College submit a follow-up report to demonstrate resolution on four recommendations: 1) Integrated Planning and Budget, 2) Program Review, 3) Research Planning (Systems) and 4) Course Outlines/Prerequisites/SLOs.

Upon receiving this information in the summer of 2009, the Superintendent/President of Feather River College immediately met with his President's Staff team to discuss a response plan. The result was the development of a focused work plan that contained objectives tied to each recommendation along with responsible parties and specific deadlines for objective completion. Though the work plan was modified during the summer and fall semester as more understanding took place, the core of the work plan remained the same and guided work toward resolving the accreditation team recommendations. In the following sections, each recommendation's work plan is provided along with a brief description of the results and findings.

In addition to the completion of a work plan, another important result from the summer planning was the creation of four different "leadership" teams composed of members that had expertise in the recommendation areas. These leadership teams had members from different campus constituencies to capture the broadest perspective and input. The following sections also describe who these individuals were and what they brought to the resolution of the recommendations. In addition, an overall oversight and coordinating group consisting of President Ron Taylor, Chief Instructional Officer Michael Bagley and Academic Senate President Chris Connell met weekly to review progress, and further, the campus newsletter published updates on the progress.

This follow-up report benefited from review and feedback from the campus at large and the college's Board of Trustees at their October 8 meeting.

Lastly, it is important to note that the recommendation numbers refer to the recommendation numbers from the initial accrediting site visit team in the spring of 2006. Thus, though this report only addresses four recommendations, the last recommendation noted is listed as recommendation six (6).

Recommendation 1: Integrated Planning and Budget

Accrediting Team:
"The team recommends that the college should integrate the planning and budget processes at various levels of the District so that the budget allocations are directly linked to the planning process, and clearly communicate and delineate the process as well as who is responsible. (Standards I.B.1, I.B.2, III.D, IV.A.2, and IV.A.3)"

Leadership Team for Response

The team that led this effort consisted of Dr. Ron Taylor, Superintendent/President, as lead, with the members of the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) providing insight and practical input and assisting with drafting new forms, process descriptions, and policies, as well as assisting with explanations to colleagues in the various campus constituencies. Ms. Connie Litz, administrative assistant to the Chief Student Services Officer, provided leadership with Student Services managers, as did Dr. Bagley in the absence of the Chief Student Services Officer, who had just taken a position at another institution. Dr. Taylor led discussions among administrators through his President's Staff meetings, and Interim Human Resources Director Jamie Cannon provided key support and input in assembling sample templates from other institutions for the Administrative Services Comprehensive Program Review model. Chief Financial Officer Jim Scoubes provided key input related to the revised format for budget development. Work on the updating of the website was a teamwork effort led by Cynthia Hall, Assistant to the President, Mick Presnell, webmaster and Distance Education Coordinator, and Dr. Taylor. The members of Cabinet played a key role in evaluating the process for its suitability within FRC's governance structure. Final approval of the policy documents was led not only by Dr. Taylor, but also by the President of the Academic Senate, Dr. Chris Connell, and the President of the Classified Senate, Ms. Jodi Beynon.

Work Plan for Response

Recommendation 1: Integrated Planning and Budget (Chairs: Taylor, Litz)	Responsible Parties	Completion Date
Agree on revised model for planning and the planning calendar	SPC	June 16
Revised model for planning & planning calendar to Board at retreat	Taylor	July 13
Prepare action agenda for Institutional Day—hands-on activity & fall semester follow-through	Taylor et al.	August 3
Set up new arrangements for oversight & workflow related to planning web page (& IR web page) & planning calendar	Presnell, Taylor, Hall	August 18
Revised model for planning & planning calendar based on	SPC, Taylor	August 21

feedback/input from Institutional Day work		
Revised model for planning & planning calendar proposed to Cabinet & governance groups along with modifications as needed to AP 3250, 6200, 2510 (latter two did not need immediate modification)	SPC, Taylor	Sept 3
Propose new format for Budget Development (integrate budget development with Annual Program Review)	Scoubes, Budget, SPC	September 18
Complete revision of the way planning documents, accreditation information, and related materials are presented on website.	Presnell, Taylor, Hall	September 28
Revised model for planning & planning calendar to Board at BOT meeting	SPC, Cabinet, Taylor	September 17, October 8
Revised BPs (3250, 6200, 2510) to Board if needed (latter two not needed immediately)	SPC, Cabinet, Taylor	September 17
Consider hiring consultant to assist with planning, accountability processes	SPC, Taylor, et al.	October 16
Revised BPs, APs posted	Hall	September 21
Submit Budget to Board, containing cuts based on mission, strategic priorities	Scoubes et al.	October 8
Initiate re-draft of Strategic Plan to align with Accreditation Standards, etc.	SPC	September 18, October16
Review new data from Vision Work, Student Survey, etc.	IR group, SPC	November20
Submit proposed re-draft of Strategic Plan (to align with Accreditation Standards and respond to new data) *{Hereafter, follow Year One calendar}*	SPC	December 11

Summary Description of Work Plan Activities

After receiving the visiting team's draft report in late May, Superintendent/President Taylor convened two special summertime meetings of the college's Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) and explained that the recommendation on integrated planning would be renewed. Furthermore, the Committee must complete and formalize its work on a revised planning process (see minutes and agendas of SPC meetings). At its meeting on June 16, the central issues that needed to be addressed concerning the draft process were resolved in principle, and all that remained was to put the process into a clear, understandable format with explanations and to prepare any changes to policy required by the new process.

At the July 13 Board of Trustees retreat, Dr. Taylor presented to the Board the draft revised planning process flowcharts and related notes resulting from the work done by SPC. Subsequent SPC meetings in July and August reviewed documents presenting the revised process in detail; many

suggestions for ease of understanding and effectiveness of implementation were made and incorporated into the documents that were presented to the campus community by Dr. Taylor on Institutional Day, August 11. The Institutional Day activity was a hands-on review of the planning flowcharts, in small groups, with input submitted via feedback forms (see Institutional Day agenda and handouts).

At the SPC meeting on August 18, Dr. Taylor presented a collation of all the input received on the planning process and the college mission statement during the Institutional Day activity and led the group in a final revision process. Among the concerns raised in the feedback were questions as to how the integration of budget development with planning would be implemented, who would see to ensuring implementation and continuity of the new process, and how constituency input played a role in the process. To address these questions, SPC made revisions to the flowcharts and accompanying explanatory notes, which were formalized in new versions during the following days, and reviewed by SPC members via email prior to the September 3 meeting of Cabinet. At the Cabinet meeting, members discussed the intent of the revised process thoroughly, along with revisions of Board Policy (BP) and Administrative Procedures (AP) on Institutional Planning (BP/AP 3250), designed to implement the new process. With minor modifications, Cabinet passed the revised BP and AP, contingent on approval of the same documents by both Academic Senate and Classified Senate (see Cabinet minutes and agenda for September 3). SPC conducted a final paper review of the documentation at its September 4 meeting. The BP and AP drafts were approved by both Senates, and the BP 3250 revision was approved by the Board of Trustees on September 17 (see Board of Trustees agenda and handouts for September 17 meeting).

Meanwhile, budget development for 2009-10 has continued during the summer months due to the ongoing state budget crisis and uncertainty as to the depth of the cuts for Feather River College. Even after the Board of Trustees approved a Tentative Budget in June (see Board of Trustees September 17 agenda, item cover page and minutes), Superintendent/President Taylor convened an extraordinary Budget Work Group that held a series of meetings during the summer months. This group, and various subgroups and individuals, conducted a thorough review of the college's proposed expenditures and suggested ways to achieve savings. During this process, Dr. Taylor proposed the formulation of explicit criteria for considering and prioritizing budget reductions. These criteria included mission-relatedness (see Evidence 11: agendas and handouts from first 2-3 meetings of Budget Work Group). In addition, during the regular preparation of the Tentative Budget throughout the spring 2009 semester, the Budget Committee reviewed budget proposals that identified specific Strategic Plan goals and objectives as pertinent to each proposed line item (see sample budget submissions). The college's Final Budget is

scheduled to be approved by the Board of Trustees on October 8, based on the work done during the regular budget development process in spring 2009, as well as the special Budget Work Group process conducted in summer 2009. Both processes considered and prioritized budget proposals according to their mission-relatedness and their effectiveness in assisting the college to achieve its adopted strategic priorities.

The college has continued work toward revising its Vision and Mission statements and its Strategic Plan and master plans. The work on a new Vision statement, though referred to by Superintendent/President Taylor in campus meetings in fall 2008, began in earnest at an Institutional Day meeting on Jan. 11, 2009. This was a hands-on, group activity in which all college regular staff participated, providing responses to questions aimed at re-framing an appropriate long-term future for the college (see January 11, 2009 Institutional Day agenda). Later in the spring 2009 semester, a group was assigned to collate the input from this exercise, and the results of their work were presented at a campus meeting on March 20, 2009 (see Campus Community meeting March 20 agenda, handout). Questions based on these results were prepared for student focus groups conducted by the same staff work group during May 2009 (see 9/24/09 email by Bruce Baldwin). In addition, 310 students responded to a survey on the same questions. Results of these student focus groups and the survey were presented at a Campus Community meeting on September 25, 2009 (see Campus Community meeting agenda and handout). During summer and early fall 2009, Dr. Taylor asked Bruce Baldwin, Director of Outreach, and Josh Taylor, Coordinator of Community Relations, to organize community forums to solicit the input of community members on the same (or very similar) questions. These groups were conducted on July 15 in Quincy, on September 2 in Chester, and on September 9 in Portola. Additional community forums are planned for Greenville and Quincy during the latter half of the fall term. The results of these discussions will be reviewed by SPC as part of the input considered for revising the Mission and Vision statements and the Strategic Plan, as well as the master plans. The SPC plans to propose revisions to these documents according to the newly revised planning calendar. Initial drafts will be prepared for SPC review and discussion at meetings in November and December, with campus constituency review in early spring 2010.

The SPC discussed the process for revising the Vision and Mission Statements, as well as the Strategic Plan and master plans, at its meetings on September 4 and September 18. At the SPC meeting in October, it is expected that SPC will finalize its assignments and timeline for drafting revisions.

Next Steps

The college has taken great strides in formally integrating its planning and budget processes. The revised planning process addresses the annual calendar for submission of budget proposals, a necessary part of campus life, and combines this process with annual submission of updated goals and objectives, reporting on prior year progress on goals and objectives, and new program review information. In response to general consensus that the budget development process needed to be moved up, the submission of an Annual Program Review which includes a program-level budget proposal for the following year, is scheduled for October (see Annual Cycle flowchart). The new planning process also separates the multi-year process of developing or updating major Strategic Plan goals from this regular annual process, and links the two through reference to Strategic Plan goals and program-level objectives. In this way, every year's budget will be developed in concert with updates to planning goals and review of progress on existing goals—while the longer-term needs of the institution as a whole will be reviewed on a three-year cycle, when the Strategic Plan is revised or updated (see Multi-Year Cycle flowchart and schedule). While budget development has always taken strategic goals into account, the Strategic Planning Committee and Budget Committee, are now required to work together on reviewing major strategic priorities prior to developing the following year's budget (part of the "Annual Cycle"). The first joint meeting of the Strategic Planning Committee and Budget Committee took place on October 2 (see Evidence 20: agenda and minutes for joint meeting). Responsibility for ensuring implementation of the process rests with the Superintendent/President and the Strategic Planning Committee, until such time as the administrative ranks are filled out and related tasks can be delegated.

In addition to the newly revised and formalized planning-and-budgeting process, the Program Review process has been updated and revised to integrate thoroughly with the planning process (see following section on Program Review). To achieve clarity and to avoid confusion on how these processes relate both on an annual basis and on multi-year schedules, the term "Annual Program Review" has been adopted for the annual update of program-level plans and budget proposals, while the term "Comprehensive Program Review" has been adopted for the more thorough review process that takes place for every college program once every three years, or once every four years. Thus, in addition to linking budget development with planning, the new planning process incorporates review of Program Review information.

Next steps for implementation of the new planning-and-budgeting process include the following:

- Approval of Final 2009-10 Budget to Board of Trustees, October 8
- Presentation of AP 3250 (Institutional Planning procedures) to Board of Trustees, October 8
- Submission of Annual Program Review documents (using new template including budget proposals) by October 30.
- SPC assigns subcommittee and timeline for drafting revised Vision and Mission Statements, using input from Institutional Day, community forums, student focus groups, etc. —October 16.
- SPC assigns timeline and tasks for drafting and proposing revisions to Strategic Plan and Educational Master Plan—October 16.
- Additional community forums in Greenville & Quincy to collect input on vision for future of FRC—October 2010 & November 2010.
- Update of AP6200, Budget Preparation, submitted to Cabinet—November 5, 2009
- Joint meeting of Budget Committee and SPC to review strategic priorities, November 20, 2009.
- Budget Committee reviews initial draft of comprehensive district budget based on Annual Program review budget proposals, December 2009.
- SPC reviews submitted drafts of Vision and Mission Statements, Strategic Plan, and Educational Master Plan—December 11.
- SPC presents revised draft Vision and Mission Statements, Strategic Plan draft, and Educational Master Plan draft to campus community, January 14 Institutional Day.
- Budget Committee prepares initial assessment of 2010-11 budget, identifying needed reductions based on state fiscal information as well as Annual Program Review budget proposals—February 2010.
- Joint meeting(s) of SPC and Budget Committee to discuss prioritization of budget proposals based on Strategic Plan priorities, mission, and available resources—March 2010.
- Governance groups review draft revisions of Vision and Mission Statements, Strategic Plan, and Educational Master Plan, per Multi-Year Cycle calendar, spring 2010.
- Draft Vision and Mission Statements, Strategic Plan, and Educational Master Plan approved by Cabinet, April-May 2010.
- Draft Vision and Mission Statements, Strategic Plan, and Educational Master Plan presented to, and approved by, Board of Trustees, May 2010.
- August 2010 SPC prepares and implements timeline and process for development of institutional Self Study.

Evidence for Recommendation 1

To assist the visiting accrediting team in verifying Feather River College's progress on the recommendations, the following samples of evidence have been made available for review for Recommendation 1:

Evidence 1. SPC agenda & minutes for May, 2009.
Evidence 2. SPC agenda, handouts & minutes for June 16, 2009.
Evidence 3. July 13, 2009, Board Retreat agenda & selected handouts.
Evidence 4. SPC agendas, minutes & handouts for July & August meetings.
Evidence 5. August 11, 2009, Institutional Day agenda & handouts.
Evidence 6. SPC agenda, handouts & minutes for August 18, 2009.

Evidence 7. Cabinet agenda, handouts & minutes for September 3, 2009.
Evidence 8. SPC agenda, handouts & minutes for September 4, 2009.
Evidence 9. September 17, 2009, Board of Trustees agenda, board item, & minutes.
Evidence 10. May 2009 Board of Trustees agenda, Tentative Budget item cover page, & minutes.
Evidence 11. Budget Work Group agendas, handouts & notes from June-July first meetings.
Evidence 12. Spring 2009 sample Budget Committee budget proposal. Facilities/Maintenance?
Evidence 13. October 8, 2009, Board of Trustees agenda.
Evidence 14. January 11, 2009, Institutional Day agenda.
Evidence 15. September 24, 2009 email by Bruce Baldwin.
Evidence 16. March 20**,** 2009, Campus Community Meeting agenda & handouts.
Evidence 17. September 25, 2009, Campus Community Meeting agenda & handout.
Evidence 18. Annual Cycle Planning Flowchart.
Evidence 19. Multi-Year Cycle Planning Flowchart and Schedule.
Evidence 20. October 2, 2009 agenda and handouts for joint meeting of SPC and Budget Committee.

Recommendation 2: Program Review

Accrediting Team:
"The team recommends that the college instructional program review process be expanded and the non-instructional program review process implemented, to include student services, library and learning support services; where each incorporates good practices, ongoing and timely reviews, data analysis and assessment to support student learning achievement; and is fully integrated into institutional planning and budget processes. (Standards I.B, I.B.1, II.A.1.b, II.A.1.c, II.A.1.e, II.A.2.f, II.B.1, II.B.3.c, II.C.1, II.C.1.a, III.A.1, III.A.4, III.B.3, IV.A.1, IV.A.3, IV.A.5, IV.B.2, IV.B.2.b)"

Leadership Team for Response

The following three leadership team members comprised the oversight of recommendation two on program review: 1) Michael N. Bagley – Administration/Dean of Instruction, 2) Jodi Beynon - Student Services/Program Coordinator, Transition Services, and 3) Russell Reid – Faculty/Agriculture, Equine Studies. Each of these members represented different campus constituencies and brought necessary perspectives to achieve growth in the college's overall program review process. Michael Bagley took the overall lead and integrated the efforts of the other two leaders, where Jodi Beynon gave input in her role on the Student Services Council and Russell Reid gave input in his role on the Strategic Planning Committee. These efforts and accomplishments will be further described below in the summary description of the work plan accomplishments.

Work Plan for Response

Recommendation 2: Program Review (Chairs: Bagley, Beynon, Reid)	Responsible Parties	Completion Date
Convene a discussion to settle on a definition of "program," and post the resulting definition	Bagley, Council on Instruction, SPC	August 21
Add description of program review to AP 3250, review AP 6200 & 2510 for possible modifications needed after AP 3250 adjusted	SPC	September 3
Develop comprehensive, institution-wide schedule for Program Review	SPC	September 18
Develop revised/updated template for Annual Program Review & Comprehensive Program Review, for Instruction	Bagley et al.	September 18
Develop revised/updated template for Annual Program Review & Comprehensive Program Review, for Student Services	Bagley, SSC	September 18
Develop revised/updated template for Annual Program Review & Comprehensive Program Review, for Admin Services	Bagley, Taylor, Cannon, Pres Staff	September 18
Complete and post remaining 2008-09	Bagley et al.	September

instructional program reviews		17
Complete and post 2009-10 instructional program reviews	Bagley et al.	October 23

Summary Description of Work Plan Activities

The definition of what a "program" is has been a question discussed across the campus, over several years and in many committees. Names for instructional programs were first based upon disciplines that had associate-degrees connected with them, while names for student services programs have evolved primarily on areas that had state or federal reporting requirements. Though the reasoning for both was sound, application was less successful in the instructional area due to a lack of full-time faculty responsible for certain degree programs. Consequently, some originally defined program reviews, such as Foreign Languages and Anthropology/Sociology had not had comprehensive program reviews as part-time faculty were the primary instructors in these areas.

The unsuccessful completion of all the instructional program reviews and subsequent recommendation from the accreditation evaluation team to strengthen the program review process led to a new analysis of what denotes a program. The Student Services Council, the lead student services committee on campus, evaluated program definitions and voted to continue with existing program areas. Similarly, the President's Staff, the administrative group that supports the president, agreed to continue with existing administrative program definitions. However, the Arts and Sciences Division of instruction made several new definitions of instructional programs in its first meeting of the fall 2009 semester. For example, the former Foreign Languages and English programs were combined to form a Language Arts instructional program, and the former anthropology/sociology and history programs were combined to form a new Social Science program. The newly defined programs now all have full-time faculty members to provide key analysis for them and are more integrated than past programs allowing for a more holistic approach to planning and program improvement.

The Council on Instruction, the lead instructional committee, and the Strategic Planning Committee, the chief campus planning committee, both reviewed the new and past definitions of programs and supported all the changes.

The modification of program review definitions, templates, and role in the planning process necessitated the review and update of administrative procedures. First, as described in the above write-up for Recommendation 1, the planning process for the college as a whole was significantly restructured to clearly delineate planning and budget integration. To achieve this, it was decided in the Strategic

Planning Committee and in President's Staff to move to an annual program review structure in addition to a comprehensive program process that occurs every three to four years. Changes as substantial as this required a Cabinet review of the following administrative procedures: AP3250 – Institutional Planning and AP6200 – Budget Preparation.

The key addition to existing AP3250 was the following paragraph demonstrating the change to annual program review cycles and the new annual program review template that denotes the connection to budget development:

> "Annual priorities and needs shall be made known to the Strategic Planning Committee and the Budget Committee by means of a single document containing (1) a program review update, (2) a progress report on goals and objectives from the previous year, (3) goals and objectives for the next year (these may be from one to three years in scope), and (4) a proposed budget. This annual Program Review document will be due by a date in October, to be announced by the end of August. The Superintendent/President shall determine the annual planning calendar after consultation with the Strategic Planning Committee, the Cabinet, the Associated Students, and the two Senates."

The administrative procedure on budget development, AP6200, notes that the budget committee will take into account "instructional program alterations or expansions" as it prioritizes budget requests. The modification of the planning process to bring annual program reviews to the budget committee in mid-fall will likely bring changes to both AP6200 and AP2510 – Participation in Local Decision-Making, as more data will be available for decision-making.

The decision to modify the program-review process in the college's updated structure of integrated planning prompted the development of new annual program review templates. The chief instructional officer, Michael Bagley, spearheaded the development of this shorter version of a comprehensive program review. Dr. Bagley presented a draft annual review template at the August 27, 2009, Council on Instruction meeting where much feedback and improvement resulted. Specific ideas that came from this meeting included: "it needed to be useful, quick, and relevant." Further, the template which had three areas to begin with (accomplishments from the past year, current year objectives, and a budget request for the upcoming year), had an additional section requested by the Council on Instruction (summary update from comprehensive program review) to allow for the inclusion of any unexpected needs from the past comprehensive program review. The improved draft of the annual program review template then went for review at the September 4, 2009, Strategic Planning Committee where further edits were given for improvement (primarily in the area of clarification of

wording). The Student Services Council supported the annual program review template at its September 9, 2009, meeting with the minor change that appendix data requests be different.

It was decided at the September 14, 2009, President's Staff meeting that the annual program review template should be consistent in form across instruction, student services, and administrative service areas. The updated and final approved annual program review template was given its blessing at the September 18, 2009, Strategic Planning Committee meeting.

Simultaneous with annual program review template development, each major governance group worked through the process to take new program definitions and set a new time-line for completion of comprehensive program reviews (COI – 8/27/09, SSC – 9/09/09). The comprehensive program reviews are larger and less frequent than the annual program reviews, and in theory, utilize information and trends from these smaller, annual program reviews.

During the last site visit in May 2009, some instructional program reviews weren't completed. Since this time, every program review that was due has been completed (see program review website for assignment list). It is important to note that some of the disciplines have been put into a different program configuration from the most recent site visit in May 2009, such as English which was itself defined to be a program and is now under the program rubric Language Arts. Program reviews were archived on college public folders, but now, in an effort to organize all planning on the Feather River College website, program reviews will be stored on the college website.

Next Steps

The final approval of AP3250 has also required review of AP6200 and AP2510 to determine appropriate modifications to capture the implementation impact of the annual program review cycle. It is expected that an updated AP6200 will be complete by December 2009 and an updated AP2510 will be complete by February 2010.

Annual program review templates were distributed the first week of October, with a submission deadline of October 30, 2009, for all defined program areas (instruction, student services, and administrative services).

The program-review web link needs updating and revising from campus feedback. This will be an on-going process as people access the existing program-review web link to study program reviews for budget development and general evaluation.

<u>Evidence for Recommendation 2</u>

To assist the visiting accrediting team in verifying Feather River College's progress on the recommendations, the following samples of evidence have been made available for review for Recommendation 2:

Evidence 21. Art and Science Division Minutes for August 13, 2009.
Evidence 22. Administrative procedure: AP3250.
Evidence 23. Council on Instruction agenda, minutes for August 27, 2009.
Evidence 24. Student Services Council agenda, minutes, and handouts for September 2, 2009.
Evidence 25. Strategic Planning Committee agenda, minutes for September 4, 2009.
Evidence 26. Student Services Council agenda, minutes, and handouts for September 9, 2009.
Evidence 27. President's Staff agenda, minutes for September 14, 2009.
Evidence 28. Strategic Planning Committee agenda, minutes for September 18, 2009.
Evidence 29. Feather River College program review website (Program Review Assignments and posted program reviews).
Evidence 30. New annual program review template.

Recommendation 4: Research Planning (Systems)

<u>Accrediting Team:</u>
"The team recommends that the college refine its process for the incorporation of data from its various service areas that assist in planning activities, ensuring that all necessary information is entered into the system so the widest range of research and planning information can be extracted. (Standards I.B.5, I.B.6, and I.B.7)"

<u>Leadership Team for Response</u>

An Institutional Research (IR) Oversight Group was created to facilitate institutional research by coordinating the formation of ad hoc teams to conduct individual research projects. This newly formed committee was a response to the campus need for coordinated data collection and analysis. As it works with other committees on campus, especially those responsible for budgeting and planning, the role and work flow of the committee will be clarified and refined. Initially the committee is charged with reviewing research needs that are brought to the committee regarding priorities, procedures for data collection and analysis, and the proposed allocation of campus resources to conduct the research. Additionally, the IR Oversight Group is working with input from the various constituencies to develop standardized data reports and templates that will provide information that is essential to data-driven decision making. There are currently four members of the IR Oversight Group that represent each of the College constituencies: one administrator, one faculty member, one supervisor, and one classified staff member.

The following team was assembled to address most of the tasks enumerated in the work plan below: Michael Bagley, Mick Presnell, Director of Distance Education, Bryon Hughes, Office of Instruction Technical Assistant, and various faculty members contributed information and expertise to the planning and accountability process.

Michael Bagley, Mick Presnell, and Bryon Hughes designed, prepared, and conducted the statistical analysis this research project. Malia Hard and Bryon Hughes performed the data downloads from the Banner system and other data sources that were used in the previously noted research analyses. Michael Bagley and Bryon Hughes prepared the project summaries and other progress reports that were utilized in the program reviews completed in the fall 2009 (e.g., see sample Excel data sheets for disciplines).

Work Plan for Response

Recommendation 4: Research Planning (Chairs: Groh, Presnell, Heaney)	Responsible Parties	Completion Date
Conduct student survey & focus groups	Baldwin et al.	May 23
Reassign IR Duties	Taylor	July 1
Hold meetings concerning data needs	Taylor	July 27, August 5
Set up new arrangements for oversight & workflow related to IR	SPC	July 22
Generate Data-sets for Remaining Instructional Program Reviews	IR group	August 10
Generate Sample Data-set for Enrollment Management Planning	IR group	August 10
Collect feedback/input from Institutional Day review of Sample Enrollment Mgt Data-set	Taylor	August 18
Generate Revised Data-sets for Remaining Instructional Program Reviews	IR group	August 25
Hold campus discussion on SLO's, student 'vision' data, data to be used in strategic planning	Taylor et al.	September 25
Hold discussions of data during Flex Day (Student Services, Instruction)	Bagley et al.	October 13
Identify Specific Data-sets to be Generated for On-going Planning in 2009-10 & 2010-11 (Banner-applicable)	SPC, IR group	October 16
Evaluate effectiveness of IR workflow & support	SPC, IR group	October 26
Generate institutional data for review by SPC and campus community	IR oversight group	November 20
Present new data from Vision Work, Student Survey, etc. to SPC	Baldwin, IR group	November 20
Produce Data Book for use by campus community	IR oversight group	Jan. 14, 2010

Summary Description of Work Plan Activities

After his exit interview with the Midterm Report site visit team on May 7, and after receiving the site visit team's draft report, the Superintendent/President concluded that one of the key issues related to Recommendation 4 was weak oversight of the Institutional Research function at the college. He also questioned whether performance of this function included sufficient initiative and expertise. Therefore, one of the first steps he took was to reassign Institutional Research duties. He sought advice from his administrative team, and spoke with the college's MIS Specialist, Malia Hard, who was known for her ability to extract data effectively from the college's database. As a result of these discussions, he determined that the best immediate course of action was to form an "IR Oversight Group" which could provide the guidance for the IR function, and ensure that current staff—the MIS Specialist, the

scheduler, the webmaster, and others—could handle the related workload effectively. The reassignment of duties was initiated with the new fiscal year, on July 1, and the oversight group was set up at a special meeting of the Strategic Planning Committee on July 27, 2009 (see agenda for July 27, 2009 SPC meeting).

Then, to convey the importance of this recommendation and to begin putting the IR function on a fresh footing, he also held meetings focused on the college's data needs with selected staff and administrators who had related expertise, experience, and interest (see agendas for July 27 and August 5 meetings on data needs). One of the purposes of these meetings was to organize the preparation of sample data sets for review by campus constituents on Institutional Day, August 11, as well as to determine how to navigate the differences in data accessibility between the college's historical enrollment software (COCO) and the newly adopted Banner system. At the general campus meeting for Institutional Day (August 11), Dr. Taylor conducted a preliminary discussion of a sample data-set (data pertinent to FRC's enrollment management), and also indicated that he had reassigned IR duties and established a new group for oversight of this function (see Institutional Day agenda and handouts for August 11, 2009).

The IR Oversight Group then established guidelines for research projects. The framework that has been implemented to accomplish the research function includes the ad-hoc teams that conduct the actual data analysis, report writing, presentations, and so forth. These IR project teams have members that are responsible for the following aspects of a research project:

1) Provide overall direction and monitor the progress for each research project.

2) Contribute information and expertise to the planning and accountability process.

3) Design, prepare, and conduct the statistical analysis for each research project.

4) Perform the data downloads from the Banner system and/or obtain information from other data sources.

5) Prepare the project summaries and other progress reports for oral and written presentation.

6) Write the final report and present the findings for each research project.

Having established the new framework for oversight of Institutional Research, staff was assigned various initial tasks to assist with institutional planning and program review. Data sets for the remaining instructional program reviews were generated, enabling completion of those program review documents (see sample data-set for program review). A new data set for enrollment management was created and reviewed by staff on Institutional Day, August 11 (see Institutional Day handout--enrollment

management spreadsheet). Various kinds of data were gathered to put together a rough prototype for a data book that was distributed to staff at a campus meeting on September 25, 2009, to assist the Strategic Planning Committee with determining what sorts of data should be regularly generated and used in institutional planning. At the same meeting, the Student Satisfaction Survey results were distributed to the staff that attended, and SLOAC Committee members presented the pilot project on college-wide SLO's that was conducted in Spring 2009 (see September 25, 2009 Campus Community Meeting agenda, notes and handouts). As a result of these discussions, and the efforts that led to them, college staff collectively have a better understanding of SLO's, and the college is poised to make more consistent use of data in its institutional planning.

During the weeks leading up to the completion of this Follow-up Report, one of the aims of the plan for addressing Recommendation 4 was to make a determination whether the new reassignment and oversight of Institutional Research is working well, and holds promise for the long term. Just prior to composing this report, the principal parties involved in this determination—the IR Oversight Group itself, the various staff helping to produce data reports, members of the Strategic Planning Committee, and the senior administrators of the college—arrived at a consensus that the oversight process holds great promise and should be continued, but that the staffing of the IR function itself needs strengthening. Thus, a recommendation has been made to the Superintendent/President that the recruitment of a dedicated researcher be resumed. It is anticipated that this recruitment will be approved by the Board of Trustees at their November meeting (see Superintendent/President email poll of IR Oversight Group et al.; agenda for October 16 SPC meeting; September 28 & October 12 President's Staff agendas & minutes).

Since the Midterm Report and site visit, some research-related activities initiated earlier continued and reached fulfillment. During April, 2009, the work group that had sifted and collated staff responses to the Vision Exercise of January 14, 2009, used those responses as a basis for a new student questionnaire concerning student's perceptions of the college's strengths and their sense of an appropriate long-term vision for the college. This survey was distributed in numerous classes, and over 400 surveys were returned and have since been collated and summarized. The Vision work group also conducted focus groups with student leaders during May. Notes taken during these discussions were also added to the summarized results (see summary handout from September 25, 2009, campus meeting). In addition, the college's traditional student satisfaction survey was conducted during May 2009, and a report was produced using these results (see Student Satisfaction Survey Spring 2009 booklet).

Distribution and use of these student survey results is described below, in relation to the campus meeting on September 25, 2009.

A follow-up report on the College's progress in developing research planning (systems) would not be complete without an update on Banner implementation successes since the midterm report. All areas of Banner® Unified Digital Campus are "live" now and the college has moved from trying to get basic elements up in place to investigating Banner's canned research capabilities. For example, the Director of Admissions and Records has successfully completed a 320 report (class enrollment, apportionment) for the first time using Banner.

The goal of developing a campus culture of evidence use and data analysis is much closer thanks to wide-spread Banner use. Training and use of Banner has occurred across campus and people now using and seeing the same data, and thus, credibility and trust of data has increased.

Next Steps

We plan to issue samples for each of the following types of data for review by members of the College community:

1) Program-specific information to be used in every program review.

2) Program-specific information that results from specific requests in a given year, and which goes beyond the standardized program-level reports.

3) Institutional-wide data that is issued annually and is used both to frame strategic goals, and also as a reference tool in program-level planning.

Additionally, various staff will be provided with SQL Developer to facilitate direct access to Banner data without having to rely on information contained in standard reports.

During the remaining part of the Fall 2009 semester, the college plans to hold additional discussions concerning institutional data. During the October 13 Flex Day, there will be sessions concerning data pertinent to the SLOAC effort and to Student Services program review.

The Strategic Planning Committee, using input provided by staff in response to the campus meeting on September 25, will determine which data sets to generate and use in on-going institutional planning. This determination is expected to occur at the Committee's meeting on October 16.

In fulfillment of the institutional planning calendar for updating and revising the Strategic Plan and master plan(s), the Strategic Planning Committee will review institutional data at its November 20

meeting, prior to composing new drafts of the Strategic Plan, the Educational Master Plan, and the Mission and Vision Statements.

A first complete Data Book will be produced for the use of college staff. The target date for issuing the Data Book is Institutional Day, January 14, 2010.

Assuming approval by the Board of Trustees on November 19, a fresh recruitment for an institutional researcher will be conducted and completed by a date in early January. The job duties for this institutional researcher will include work aimed at developing more user-friendly programs within Banner that allow data extraction and formatting for use in the numerous planning reports used at Feather River College.

Evidence for Recommendation 4

To assist the visiting accrediting team in verifying Feather River College's progress on the recommendations, the following samples of evidence have been made available for review for Recommendation 4:

Evidence 31. Institutional Research Team Assignments (Word Document).
Evidence 32. Excel data sheets for academic discipline.
Evidence 33. FTES summary report spreadsheet.
Evidence 34. Summary handout for September 25, 2009 campus meeting.
Evidence 35. Student Satisfaction Survey Spring 2009 booklet.
Evidence 36. Agenda for July 27, 2009 SPC meeting.
Evidence 37. Agendas for July 27 and August 5 meetings on data needs.
Evidence 38. August 11, 2009, Institutional Day agenda and handouts.
Evidence 39. Sample data set for an instructional program review.
Evidence 40. Institutional Day handout—enrollment management spreadsheet.
Evidence 41. September 25, 2009 Campus Community Meeting agenda, notes and handouts.
Evidence 42. Superintendent/President email poll of IR Oversight Group et al.; agenda for October 16 SPC meeting; September 28 & October 12 President's Staff agendas & minutes

Recommendation 6: Course Outlines/Prerequisites/SLOs

<u>Accrediting Team:</u>
"The team recommends that the college review and update all course outlines, desired prerequisites and advisories, while integrated into on-going assessment that supports student learning achievement and student learning outcomes. (Standards II.A.1.c, II.A.2, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.f)"

Leadership Team for Response

The following three leadership team members comprised the oversight of recommendation six on course outline updates and improvements: 1) Michael N. Bagley – Administration/Dean of Instruction, 2) Katie Desmond – Faculty/Political Science, and 3) Terrie Rose-Boehme – Student Services/Program Coordinator, DSP&S and Workability. Each of these members represented different campus constituencies and were able to provide guidance in overall student learning outcome planning. Michael Bagley took the overall lead and integrated the efforts of these two leaders (and other campus leaders), where Katie Desmond gave strategic input in her role on the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Cycle (SLOAC) Committee and Terrie Rose-Boehme gave direction in her role on the Student Services Council. These efforts and achievements will be further described below in the summary description of the work plan accomplishments.

Work Plan for Response

Recommendation 6: Course Outlines/Prerequisites/SLOs (Chairs: Bagley, Desmond, Rose-Boehme)	Responsible Parties	Completion Date
Comprehensive SLO & Assessment Calendar developed	CIO, SLOAC Committee	September 1
Course outlines brought up to date	Faculty, Curriculum Committee	September 4
SLOAC assessments initiated on selected courses	Faculty, Office of Instruction	September 18
Institutional (Degree-level) Assessments Reported to Campus Community at Campus Meeting	SLOAC Committee	September 25
Comprehensive SLO & Assessment Calendar posted on campus website	Mick Presnell	October 1

Summary Description of Work Plan Activities

The student learning outcome and assessment cycle (SLOAC) process required by the accrediting commission has been the catalyst for updating course outlines. The Council on Instruction

determined several years ago that for Feather River College to achieve a culture of student learning outcome assessment, it needed to start at the course level. Further, the Student Services Council knew that for college-wide SLO culture to take place, development and assessment of SLOs needed to be beyond the classroom. To avoid operating on this critical mission in silos, the Strategic Planning Committee added as one of its strategic plan goals the development of a student-learning outcome assessment cycle (SLOAC) committee that would include members from different constituencies on campus.

The SLOAC committee was spearheaded by Michael Bagley and had its first meetings in the fall of 2008. Its first mission was to develop a statement on assessment that would guide the college on what assessment is and how it should be used. However, its other most critical objective was to develop an action plan and time line to achieve ACCJC requirements on student learning outcome work by the spring of 2012 (the next full accreditation cycle visit). The SLOAC committee took several months to achieve a draft time line to present to governance groups on campus (from Student Services Council to President's Staff). The last group to give input and confirmation was the Student Services Council at its September 2, 2009 meeting.

Of all the activities necessary for recommendation resolution, bringing every course outline up to date was by far the most challenging. Though many disciplines had most of their outlines up to date, collectively there were hundreds of outlines that needed to be modified. The division chairs and Academic Senate president took strong leadership positions and worked with the faculty, part- and full-time to complete all 813 "live" course outlines, while also retiring numerous courses that are no longer part of programs. In short, the faculty performed superiorly in this time of needed action and completed every course from every program in a serious and accurate manner. It should also be noted that one faculty member in Early Childhood Education, Shelley Miller, demonstrated even further above-and-beyond dedication to course-outline and student learning outcome development. She did much research and work to complete dozens of general education course outlines that did not have full-time faculty members as instructor of record. In fact, Shelley Miller was awarded a 2009 SLO Mentor of the Year award by the California Community College Network for Student Learning Outcomes Assessment.

Michael Bagley has been directing the Office of Instruction (OOI) in the improvement of work flow and procedures for tracking course development and updates, including the SLOAC process. Much was learned through the recent updating of all Title 5 course outlines. OOI personnel are laying the foundation for a document management system which will automate much of the Title 5 tracking. It will

also make Curriculum Committee agendas, minutes, and Title 5 outlines web accessible. The new system will support report generation of course updating and SLOAC progress, provide more convenient access to Title 5 Outlines for Articulation Officers and counselors at other schools, and provide a centralized and convenient resource for FRC counselors and advisors regarding curriculum changes.

The complexity of the improvement process is worth describing in more detail, and the next couple of paragraphs shed light on it. [It should be noted that the Director of Distance Education, Dr. Mick Presnell, was the pioneer of the technical work that facilitated the success of the overall project.]

Original Process: Email attachments to Curriculum Committee members contain the meeting agenda, minutes from the previous meeting, and electronic versions of the Title 5 course outlines to be introduced, discussed, or approved as consent agenda items. Paper copies of all outlines are also distributed to Curriculum Committee members prior to the meeting and filed. A spreadsheet of course outlines is maintained by the Office of Instruction that tracks the status of courses through the approval process. Thus, the original "past" process for tracking outlines was: (1) tracking electronic and paper archives of the course outlines as they were presented to the Curriculum Committee through the various stages of review, and (2) maintaining an index of courses and the status of their changes in a spreadsheet. Then, the electronic archives of the outlines were made available to the campus community on a shared network drive.

Improved Process: The current tracking system had not scaled well as the college continued to develop and update its curriculum. It resulted in a large number of files and the spreadsheet was awkward to use for tracking the location of the electronic files. The Office of Instruction is currently in the process of revising how electronic versions of the course outlines are stored, indexed, and retrieved. The revisions include: (1) the development of a standard file naming convention to make electronic searching easier, (2) a standardized file structure for storing the documents, (3) the use of a web accessible database for tracking the approval process of outlines that provides links to the documents themselves, and (4) use of online forms for submitting and updating Title 5 course outlines. Longer range plans (2 years) for the management of Title 5 outlines includes storing all form fields of the outlines in a database enabling the ability to search outlines by any field, and the ability to produce reports on the outlines such as (1) outlines according to their SLOAC review status, (2) outlines by their satisfaction of program and college SLO's, (3) outlines according to transfer or program requirement satisfaction, and (4) outlines in customized layouts. This approach will also allow for efficient future updates of the fields of course outline forms.

The curriculum committee knew the challenge it was facing to review and guide course outline improvement and approval. At the first meeting of the semester, August 19, 2009, Michael Bagley set the stage for the task ahead, and with every single curriculum committee afterward, record-setting work took place in curriculum process. It must be noted that quality and standards were held despite the large workload. This was able to be achieved as much work was done outside of the meeting to review the course outlines, where the actual meetings were used to go over last details that required further discussion and group action.

In addition to course outline updates, faculty were reminded of their duty to complete SLO assessment of individual courses per the SLOAC time line at the fall 2009 faculty flex day (see progress report time line for faculty). At this time, Feather River College allows for differentiation of assessment methods for course-level SLOs and faculty have varied significantly on their treatment of assessment (see example SLOAC completion evidence).

Lastly, besides much work being done "behind the scenes" with faculty and the Office of Instruction, the goal of broadly communicating student learning outcome assessment work is necessary to achieve a SLOAC culture. The chair of the SLOAC committee, Michael Bagley, asked members of the SLOAC committee to share the institution-wide SLO assessment pilot study at a future campus community meeting. On September 25, 2009, at a campus community meeting, Katie Desmond, faculty member in Political Science and SLOAC committee member, gave an overview of the concept of assessment and SLOs, while also sharing the pilot study that was given to spring 2009 Feather River College graduates. This presentation illuminated many of the things happening in the area of SLOAC work and further expanded upon the importance and value of assessing student learning on a broad scale.

Another method to increase campus-wide understanding of the SLOAC process and planning in general is expanding the use of the campus website for archiving and presenting materials. Work on SLOAC and course outlines is being posted to the Feather River College website in a deliberate and detailed manner.

Next Steps

To be proactive and not face such an enormous curriculum update challenge, the establishment of a time-line for a 4-year update cycle for each discipline for outlines will be established through the

division meeting process. The council on instruction will determine who does outlines for classes without a full-time instructor and how it fits within the 4-year update cycle.

In addition, to help keep curriculum updates moving in the right direction, the Office of Instruction will be working with the IR Committee and MIS to integrate curriculum update processes within Banner to avoid "shadow systems." Portions of this needed system are planned to be tested during spring 2010 and completion tentatively estimated to be summer 2011.

Lastly, the last area of student-learning outcome development to be fully utilized is program- and certificate-level outcomes. Program leaders have been given the deadline of December 1, 2009, to complete draft program- and certificate-level outcomes.

Evidence for Recommendation 6

To assist the visiting accrediting team in verifying Feather River College's progress on the recommendations, the following samples of evidence have been made available for review for Recommendation 6:

Evidence 43. SLOAC Committee agenda and minutes for August 27, 2009.
Evidence 44. Student Services Council agenda, minutes, and handouts for September 2, 2009.
Evidence 45. Curriculum Committee agenda for August 19, 2009.
Evidence 46. Progress report time line for faculty – fall 2009 flex.
Evidence 47. Selected SLOAC course completions.
Evidence 48. Comprehensive SLO and assessment calendar.
Evidence 49.   Power Point presentation by Katie Desmond at September 25, 2009 campus. community meeting.
Evidence 50. SLOAC website.